

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
 مُحَمَّدٌ وَآلُهُ عَلَى سُلَالَةِ الْكَرِيمِ

THE ISLAMIC REVIEW

RABÍ 'UL-AWWAL 1347 A.H.

VOL. XVI. SEPTEMBER, 1928 A.C.

No. 9

NOTES

Beating about the Bush.

It will be remembered that in our issue for April-May 1928 we dealt with the moral value of certain of the Old Testament stories, pointing out that some of the verses of the Bible are such as to raise a blush, even when read in privacy, and that it is quite impossible for children of impressionable age, or even for persons of mature years, to build for themselves a high standard of life on the lessons derived from these stories.

We can, of course, never expect the clergy to endorse our views. At best, we can but look for them to beat about the bush, as it were, on the same quest as ourselves.

Below we give an amusing instance which affords us an insight into some of the most important undercurrents of thought in the Christian world of to-day, which are only awaiting a suitable opportunity to come to the surface and be seen of men.

According to the *Daily Express* for July 12, 1928, at the Congregational Conference held at Oxford on July 11, 1928, the Old Testament was referred to as a "book which should not be put into a child's hands" and "which could be dispensed with."

One of the members was reported to have said that, in the ordinary home of to-day, the Bible was as obsolete as the

ISLAMIC REVIEW

antimacassar, and that he doubted if they could find a Bible in 20 per cent. of the homes of the working people.

The Reverend John Bevan, of Balham, was even more outspoken. He said :—

There would be no great harm done if many parts of the Old Testament were lost to the sight of men and preserved only in museums or for the delectation of students. Their religious value is negligible; in fact, they have never been of the least help to true religion.

The Old Testament is not a children's book and should not be put into a child's hands. The child is not able to grasp the religious significance of it, and the result is that it just bores him stiff because it deals with a world he knows nothing about.

We should tell our congregations quite frankly that the history in the Bible has no more bearing on religious truth than any other history.

The Old Testament could be dispensed with, but it would be unwise to accustom ourselves to the thought of the Christian religion apart from its ancestry.

The reverend gentleman agrees with us in so far as the Bible—or rather the Old Testament—should not be placed in the hands of children. The reason given by him is that the average child cannot grasp its religious significance, and this may well be the case. But we wonder if, in the opinion of the reverend gentleman, even the average adult is capable of grasping that significance. We are sure, on second thoughts, in view of doubts raised by us, he will have to materially change his views.

Father or Rabb ?

The Reverend W. Cash, who was to a large extent, if indirectly, responsible for the appearance of *The Ideal Prophet*, by the Khwaja Kamālu 'd-Din, Imām of the Mosque, Woking, has now written another book,¹ in which he harps once again on the old theme that in Islam “most of the ideas so attractive to Western readers are simply Christian teaching clothed in Moslem language and uttered now in the name of Islam.”²

By way of example, the author inquires if the use of the words “Dear Father,” by Lord Headley in his verses which read:

Dear Father, Thou art very near;
I feel Thy presence everywhere—
In darkest night, in brightest day,
To show the path, direct the way.

¹ *The Expansion of Islam* (London, 1928).

² *Ibid.*, p. 232.

NOTES

is Islamic, and goes on to say, "Then the beautiful verse would help any earnest seeker after God ; but ' Dear Father ' is not Islamic at all—it is a purely Christian conception of God. Islam denies the Fatherhood of God and execrates the New Testament doctrine of God as Father. This is a good illustration of the Christian colour given to-day to the Western expression of Islam. . . ."¹

It would be waste of time here to refute those who ignorantly or maliciously suppose that the Allah of Islam is in any way different from the true God ; but sweeping statements, especially when they are both ungenerous and uncharitable, cannot be permitted to pass unchallenged.

To say that Islam denies the Fatherhood of God is manifestly incorrect. Islam does not deny it ; rather does it improve upon the Christian conception of that Fatherhood. The use of " Father " in our sacred literature, in the English language, here and there is, as often as not, due to lack of a better expression in the English language for the real and more significant Arabic word "*Rabb*"—the word with which all the Qur-ánic prayers begin. Christianity defines the conception of God by the word " Father," whereas the Qur-án prefers the use of the word *Rabb*, which is at once more comprehensive and expressive. "*Rabb*," as a matter of fact, includes the meaning of " Father," signifying, as it does, the fostering of a thing in such a manner as to make it attain one condition after another until it reaches its goal of completion. Hence *Rabb* is the author of all existence, who has not only given to the whole creation its means of nourishment, but has also, beforehand, ordained for each a sphere of capacity and, within that sphere, provided the means whereby it continues gradually to attain to perfection. It will thus be seen that the word *Rabb* conveys a far nobler, a grander idea than the word " Father," which has a very limited significance ; and it is for this reason that the Muslim prayer prefers the use of *Rabb* to that of Father in addressing the Divine Being.

But it would seem from Christian writings that it is becoming quite a fashion with them to label everything which

¹ *The Expansion of Islam*, p. 232.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

is noble and good as Christian. In the issue of *Two Worlds* for August 3, 1928, it is justly observed :—

There is a tendency to-day to take all the virtues which humanity can practise, all the ennobling characteristics which appeal to every man, whether he be a believer or a non-believer in an after-life, and call them Christian. They are no more Christian than Muslim or Buddhist. It seems to be entirely overlooked that long ages before the revelation of two thousand years ago all these virtues were practised by men who were as good and quite as noble as the mass of those who live to-day. What we want to get to know is, What are the virtues which are particularly Christian which were revealed by Christianity or improved by Christianity? There are certain forms of belief, certain theological conceptions, which are essentially Christian. It is even true that Christianity has drawn attention to the one man who embodied them in his life, but to imagine that morality and honesty had no existence prior to the coming of Christianity is merely to shut one's eyes to the obvious. While it is perfectly true that Christianity has given us some excellent men, it is also true that through the ages, and especially in mediæval times, it produced the most fiendish cruelty, and it is quite a question whether a man's morality is effected to any considerable extent by the form of theology he holds.

Prohibition in America.

It will be recalled by readers of the *Islamic Review* that we have often quoted such information as was available to us on the question of wine and intoxicants.

Below we quote some fresh evidence and illuminative facts in the hope that they will be read with interest. They go far to strengthen and consolidate the claim of the Qur-án that it is the only perfect social guide for mankind.¹ The facts are taken from an article entitled "Prohibition in America," which appeared in the weekly journal *The Methodist Times* for August 6, 1928.

The first is the economical situation. The country, thanks to its sobriety, is now revelling in an era of unexampled prosperity. A few days ago I had lunch with Bishop Edgar Blake and Dr. Hartman, the editor of *Zion's Herald*. The Bishop told us, on the authority of Professor Carver, of Harvard, that since Prohibition came into force thirty-five billion dollars had been saved by the working classes, and that insurance policies had increased from fifteen billions in 1912 to eighty billions in 1925. Three-fourths of these amounts are held by the industrial section of the community. A few weeks ago I met an

¹ " This day I have perfected for you your religion " (Qur-án, v. 3).

old Harvard man who was connected with an organization for the relief of the destitute. When Prohibition became law, poverty almost disappeared. He added that he liked "a wee drappie" of "mountain dew," but that he was willing to be deprived of it for the good of his nation.

I am at this moment the guest of Dr. and Mrs. Le Baron. He is one of our Methodist Episcopal ministers in Providence, Rhode Island, who was for six years a district superintendent and knows the Eastern States intimately. Last night he gave me some decisive illustrations of the revolution wrought by the non-liquor enactment. Tramps and parasites have almost vanished. He knows intimately the adjacent town of Taunton. Rows of saloons have been razed to the dust and superseded by beautiful villas. Families that formerly were steeped in poverty are now dashing about in motor-cars. A generation is growing up that has never seen a saloon.

Daily upon the world dawns the importance of the Islamic principles of life, and daily their truth is being forced upon it; but despite the blessings showered on mankind by the policy known as Prohibition, it is passing strange to find that that policy is being turned into an issue of grave importance and has been seized upon by all the political parties of the United States as a determining factor in the forthcoming Presidential election.

Is it because the Bible is silent on the merits and demerits of intoxicants—or, to be more exact, because the Bible, in a sense, would seem to favour their use, on the authority of the miracle of Cana as recorded in the New Testament—that people can afford to play and juggle with those principles of life whereof the importance has been acknowledged and recognized on all hands, in order to serve their own ends? There can be no two opinions on this question.

What Islam Means.

In the London weekly *The Outline* for July 28, 1928, there appeared an article under the heading "What Islam Means," the writer of which describes the early days of the Prophet and his marriage to the widow Khadija. It is in his account of the compilation of the Qur-án that an old and baseless story, alleging that Muhammad succumbed to the temptation of propitiating the Meccans by announcing that their idols

ISLAMIC REVIEW

were actually intercessors to God for man, has been re-exhumed. The fact that not only our Christian friends have sought to make capital out of this fabrication, but that some of the Muslim historians and commentators have also thought fit to take notice of it, is sufficient justification for our dealing with it in this short note. The writer says :—

The Prophet himself, nevertheless, was often near despair. Once, cross-questioned by a menacing Meccan assembly, he evaded the issue by telling them that three of their favourite idols were actually intercessors to God for man.

No doubt the writer and our opponents generally can claim to be innocent of misrepresentation in making this statement because, as we have said, of its presence in the Muslim records; but the flippancy of style and frivolous tone, too evident throughout the article, cannot so easily be disposed of. For example, the author observes :—

He became a missionary with a sword, preaching Holy War. God had appeared again to him, he declared, bidding him slay the unbeliever; and he began to harass the Meccans by attacking their Syria-bound caravans. He allied himself with Bedouin tribes, went boldly into battle, and at last forced Mecca to sue for peace, at terms which permitted the preaching of Islam throughout Arabia.

To anyone whose mental vision has not been warped by preconception or prejudice, and who is unwilling to enmesh himself in useless and lengthy discussions for the purpose of unravelling the knots surrounding this and that tale or legend, a cursory glance at the career and character of the Holy Prophet who, under the severest imaginable persecutions, never once faltered, even before his call—much less after it, when he realized the burden of responsibility devolving upon his shoulders—would be in itself sufficient to dismiss such a calumny.

As a matter of fact, the date of the first appearance of the story is just after the emigration of some of the companions of the Prophet to Abyssinia. It was then given out that the Meccans had embraced Islam. Some of the Muslims in Abyssinia believed it to be true and repaired to Mecca, only to find

on arrival, to their intense disappointment, that it was a rumour devoid of any foundation; whereupon some of them, for fear of further Meccan persecution, returned to Abyssinia.

The story referred to in the article under discussion is quoted by Tabarī, a great Muslim historian and a commentator on the Qur-án. It is recorded that when the Holy Prophet, who recited the 53rd chapter, called "The Star" (being the first chapter recited by him in public), reached the words "Have you, then, considered the Lát and the 'Uzza, and Manat, the third, the last?"¹ he added the words "These are exalted females, whose intercession is sought after." It is further related that the Prophet prostrated himself and the Meccans followed suit.

It was customary with the Meccans to boo, hiss and hoot down Muhammad whenever he recited to them the verses of the Qur-án in order to drown his words. The Qur-án makes mention of this habit of theirs in the words "And those who disbelieve say: Do not listen to this Qur-án, make noise therein, perhaps you may overcome" (xli. 26). What happened was that while the Prophet was reciting the Qur-án, some malevolent person among the Meccans, in accordance with their usual habit of rowdiness, interpolated: "These are exalted females, whose intercession is sought after"—words which the Meccans were wont to recite while performing the circumambulatory rituals round the Ka'aba—into the words of the Prophet. So that those standing at a distance took them to be the words of the Prophet.

This is, in all probability, the true foundation of the story. Although it has been rejected by the well-known authorities of Hadīth, e.g. Baihiqī, Qāzī 'Iyāz, 'Ainī, Hāfiz Munzirī, Nawawī as a pure fabrication, yet some of the narrators of Hadīth have recorded it, citing authorities therefor. Amongst these the best-known are Tabarī, Ibn Abī Hātim Ibn Nazr, Ibn Mardwaih, Ibn Ishāq, Mūsā bin 'Uqba, Abū Ma'shar. Even Hāfiz Ibn Hajr, who is an acknowledged authority on the Hadīth narratives, believes the tale to be true. It is here that non-Muslims find a handle. But no value can be attached to

¹ The Qur-án, liii. 20.

the opinions of the latter in face of the clearly expressed views of Baihiqī, 'Iyāz, 'Ainī,¹ etc.

Moreover, there is yet another and a very important fact bearing on the question which should finally dispose of the matter. The story emanates from Wāqidī, the authority of whose records has been consistently discarded and impugned by all the well-known authorities on Hadīth.²

Another argument against the non-historical character of the story is to be found in the very verses of the Qur-ān, where, it is alleged, an addition was made for the purpose of compromising with the Meccans. The insertion of such words as "These are exalted females, whose intercession is sought after," do not, in any sense, agree with the verses following, which denounce idolatry. For instance, verse 23 of the same chapter, i.e. "The Star," says: "They (idols) are not but names which you have named, you and your fathers." It is really difficult to understand how the interpolated words could ever have been made to seem congruous when all the rest of the chapter denounces idolatry. Internal evidence is dead against such an addition.

The late Right Honourable Syed Ameer 'Alī.

We regret to record the death of the Syed Ameer 'Alī. The Syed Sahib was born in Oudh, where his family had settled after living for some generations in Persia. He was educated at the Hooghly College, Calcutta, and came to England as a young man, where he was called to the Bar. He had a very successful career in India, and became the first Muslim Judge of the Bengal High Court. In 1904 he returned to England, and four years later became the first Indian Privy Councillor and a member of the Judicial Committee.

The Woking Muslim Mission, with which institution he had been connected since its inception, as Chairman of the

¹ Cf. Shiblī, *Sīratu 'n-Nabī*, (A'zamgarh, India, 1918), p. 176.

² For a complete and fuller discussion on Wāqidī the reader is referred to the *Islamic Review*, March-April and May-1926, "European Biographies of Muhammad and Muhammad bin 'Omar al-Wāqidī," by Sayyid Sulaimān Nadwī; and *Islamic Review* for April-May, June, July 1927, "Wāqidī Again," by Sayyid Sulaimān Nadwī.

MUHAMMAD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Woking Mosque Trust, loses in him a staunch friend and worthy counsellor. We offer our heartfelt sympathy to his wife and relatives in their bereavement.

It was through his literary work that the late Syed was best known to the Muslim world. His book *The Spirit of Islam* has done a vast amount of pioneer work by dispelling the clouds of misconception which have till lately obscured Islam for English-speaking people. This book, together with his *A Short History of the Saracens*, has won for him for a long time to come a place on the shelves and in the memories of those who are interested in the interpretation of Islam to the West.

MUHAMMAD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

By PROFESSOR 'ABDU 'L-AHAD DÁWÚD, B.D.

IV

MUHAMMAD IS THE "SHILOH"

JACOB, the grandson of Abraham, is lying sick in bed; he is in his one hundred and forty-seventh year, and the end is approaching rapidly. He summons his twelve sons and their families to his bedroom; and he blesses each son and foretells the future of his tribe. It is generally known as the "Testament of Jacob," and is written in an elegant Hebrew style with a poetic touch. It contains a few words which are unique and never occur again in the Bible. The Testament recalls the varied events in the life of a man who has had many ups and downs. He is reported to have taken advantage of his brother's hunger and bought his right of birth for a dish of pottage, and deceived his blind old father and obtained the blessing which by birthright belonged to Esau. He served seven years to marry Rachel, but was deceived by her father, being married to her elder sister Liah; so he had to serve another term of seven years for the former. The massacre of all the male population by his (Jacob's) two sons Simon

and Livi for the pollution of his (Jacob's) daughter Dina by Schechim, the prince of that town, had greatly grieved him. The shameful conduct of his first-born, Reubin, in defiling his father's bed by lying with his concubine was never forgotten nor forgiven by him. But the greatest grief that befel him after the loss of his beloved wife Rachel was the disappearance for many years of his favourite son Joseph. His descent into Egypt and his meeting with Joseph caused him great joy and the recovery of his lost sight. Jacob was a Prophet, and surnamed by God "Israel," the name which was adopted by the twelve tribes that descended from him.

The policy of usurpation of the birthright runs through the records of the Book of Genesis, and Jacob is represented as a hero of this violation of the rights of other persons. He is reported to give the birthright of his grandson Mnashi to his younger brother Ephraim, in spite of the remonstrances of their father Joseph (chap. xlviii.). He deprives his first-born son of his birthright and accords the blessing to Judah, his fourth son, because the former had lain with Bilha, Jacob's "concubine," who is the mother of his two sons Dan and Nephthali; and deprives the latter because he was no better than the other, inasmuch as he committed adultery with his own daughter-in-law Tamar, who bore a son who became an ancestor of David and of Jesus Christ (chap. xxv. 22, chap. xxxviii.) !

It is indeed incredible that the author, or at least the final editor, of this book was "inspired by the Holy Spirit," as the Jews and Christians allege. Jacob is reported to have married two sisters simultaneously, an action condemned by God's law (Lev. xviii. 18). In fact, with the exception of Joseph and Benjamin, his other sons are described as rough shepherds, liars (to their father and to Joseph), murderers, adulterers, which means it was a family not becoming a Prophet at all. Of course, the Muslims cannot accept any calumny against a Prophet or a righteous man unless it be expressly recorded or mentioned in the Qur-án. We do not believe the sin attributed to Judah to be true (cf. chap. xxxviii.), otherwise the blessing accorded to him by Jacob would be a contradiction;

MUHAMMAD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

and it is this very blessing that we propose to study and discuss in this article.

Jacob could not have blessed his son Judah if the latter was really the father of his own daughter-in-law's son, Peres, for both adulterers would be condemned to death by the Law of God, Who had given him the gift of prophecy (Lev. xx. 12). However, the story of Jacob and that of his not very exemplary family is to be found in the Book of Genesis (chaps. xxv.-l.).

The famous prophecy, which may be considered as the nucleus of this testament, is contained in the tenth verse of the forty-ninth chapter of Genesis as follows:—

“ The Sceptre shall not depart from Judah,
And the Lawgiver from between his feet,
Until the coming of Shiloh,
And to him belongeth the obedience of peoples.”

This is the literal translation of the Hebrew text as much as I can understand it. There are two words in the text which are unique and occur nowhere else in the Old Testament. The first of these words is “*Shilōh*,” and the other “*yiqha*” or “*yiqhath*” (by construction or contraction).

Shilōh is formed of four letters, *shīn*, *yod*, *lāmed* and *hi*. There is a “*Shiloh*,” the proper name of a town in Ephraim, (1 Sam. i., etc.), but there is no *yod* in it. This name cannot be identical with, or refer to, the town where the Ark of the Covenant or the Tabernacle was; for until then no sceptre or lawgiver had appeared in the tribe of Judah. The word certainly refers to a person, and not to a place.

As far as I can remember, all the versions of the Old Testament have preserved this original *Shiloh* without giving it a rendering. It is only the Syriac *Pshitta* (in Arabic called *al-Bessita*) that has translated it into “*He to whom it belongs.*” It is easy to see how the translator has understood the word as composed of “*sh*” abridged form of *āsher* = “*he, that,*” and *lōh* (the Arabic *lehu*) = “*is his.*” Consequently, according to the *Pshitta*, the clause will be read in the following manner: “*Until he to whom it belongeth come, And,*” etc.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

The personal pronoun "it" may refer to the sceptre and the lawgiver separately or collectively, or perhaps to the "obedience" in the fourth clause of the verse, the language being poetic. According to this important version the sense of the prediction would appear to be plainly this:—

"The royal and prophetic character shall not pass away from Judah until he to whom it belongs come, for his is the homage of peoples."

But apparently this word is derived from the verb *shalah* and therefore meaning "peaceful, tranquil, quiet and trustworthy."

It is most likely that some old transcriber or copyist *currente calamo* and with a slip of pen has detached the left side of the final letter *het*; and then it has been transformed into *hi*; for the two letters are exceedingly alike being only very slightly different on the left side.¹ If such an error has been transmitted in the Hebrew manuscript—either intentionally or not—then the word is derived from *shālāh*, "to send, to delegate," the past participle of which would be *shālūh*—that is, "one who is sent, apostle, messenger."

But there appears no reasonable cause for a deliberate change of *het* for *hi*, since the *yod* is preserved in the present shape of Shiloh, which has no *vaw* that would be necessary for the past participle *Shālūh*. Besides, I think the Septuagint has retained the Shiloh as it is. The only possible change, therefore, would be of the final letter *het* into *hi*. If such be the case, then the word would take the form of *Shilūāh* and correspond exactly to the "Apostle of Yah," the very title given to Muhammad alone "*Rāsūl Allah*," i.e. "the Apostle of God." I know that the term "*shilūāh*" is also the technical word for the "letter of divorce," and this because the divorced wife is "sent" away.

I can guess of no other interpretation of this singular name besides the three versions I have mentioned.

Of course, it goes without saying that both the Jews and

(1) $\aleph = \text{hi} = \text{h}$. $\aleph = \text{het} = \text{h}$

MUHAMMAD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Christians believe this blessing to be one of the foremost Messianic prophecies. That Jesus, the Prophet of Nazareth, is a Christ or Messiah no Muslim can deny, for the Qur-án does acknowledge that title. That every Israelite King and High Priest was anointed with the holy oil composed of olive oil and various spices we know from the Hebrew Scriptures (Lev. xxx. 23-33). Even the Zardushti Koresh King of Persia is called God's Christ: "Thus says the Lord to His Christ Cyrus," etc. (Isa. xlv. 1-7).

It would be superfluous here to mention that although neither Cyrus nor Jesus were anointed by the sacred anointment, yet they are called Messiahs.

As to Jesus, even if his prophetic mission were recognized by the Jews, his Messianic office could never be accepted by them. For none of the marks or characteristics of the Messiah they expect are to be found in the man whom they attempted to crucify. The Jew expects a Messiah with the sword and temporal power, a conqueror who would restore and extend the kingdom of David, and a Messiah who would gather together the dispersed Israel unto the land of Canaan, and subdue many nations under his yoke; but they could never acclaim as such a preacher upon the Mount of Olives, or one born in a manger.

To show that this very ancient prophecy has been practically and literally fulfilled in Muhammad the following arguments can be advanced. By the allegorical expressions "the Sceptre" and "Law-giver" it is unanimously admitted by the commentators to mean the royal authority and the prophecy respectively. Without stopping long to examine the root and derivation of the second singular word "yiqha," we may adopt either of its two significations, "obedience" or "expectation."

Let us follow the first interpretation of Shiloh as given in the Pshiṭta version: "he to whom it belongs." This practically means "the owner of the sceptre and the law," or "he who possesses the sovereign and legislative authority, and his is the obedience of nations." Who, then, can this mighty Prince and great Legislator be? Certainly not Moses,

ISLAMIC REVIEW

for he was the first organizer of the Twelve Tribes of Israel, and before him there never appeared a king or prophet in the tribe of Judah. Decidedly not David, because he was the first king and prophet descended from Judah. And evidently not Jesus Christ, because he himself repudiated the idea that the Messiah whom Israel was expecting was a son of David (Matt. xxii. 44, 45; Mark xii. 35-37; Luke xx. 41-44). He has left no written law, and never dreamt of assuming the royal sceptre; in fact, he advised the Jews to be loyal to Cæsar and pay him tribute, and on one occasion the crowds attempted to make him a king, but he escaped and hid himself. His Gospel was written on the tablet of his heart, and he delivered his message of "good news," not *in scripto*, but orally. In this prophecy there is no question of the salvation from original sin by the blood of a crucified person, nor of a reign of a god-man over human hearts. Besides, Jesus did not abrogate the Law of Moses, but he distinctly declared that he had come to fulfil it; nor was he the last Prophet; for after him St. Paul speaks of many "prophets" in the Church.

Muhammad came with military power and the Qur-ân to replace the old Jewish worn-out sceptre and the impracticable and old-fashioned law of sacrifices and of a corrupt priesthood. He proclaimed the purest religion of the one true God, and laid down the best practical precepts and rules for morals and conduct of men. He established the religion of Islam which has united into one real brotherhood many nations and peoples who associate no being with the Almighty. All Muslim peoples obey the Apostle of Allah, love and reverence him as the founder of their religion, but never worship him or give him divine honour and attributes. He crushed and put an end to the last vestiges of the Jewish principality of Qureihda and Khaibar, having destroyed all their castles and fortifications.

The second interpretation of the tetragram "*Shilh*," pronounced Shiloh, is equally important and in favour of Muhammad. As it was shown above, the word signifies "tranquil, peaceful, trustworthy, quiet" and so forth. The

MUHAMMAD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Aramaic form of the word is *Shilya*, from the same root *Shala* or *shla*. This verb is not used in Arabic.

It is a well-known fact in the history of the Prophet of Arabia that, previous to his call to the Apostleship, he was extremely quiet, peaceful, trustworthy, and of a contemplative and attractive character; that he was surnamed by the people of Mecca "Muhammad al-Emin." When the Meccans gave this title "Emin" or "Amin" to Muhammad they had not the remotest idea of "Shiloh," yet the ignorance of the idolatrous Arabs was made use of by God to confound the unbelieving Jews, who had scriptures and knew their contents. The Arabic verb *amana*, like the Hebrew *aman*, to be firm, constant, secure," and therefore "to be tranquil, faithful and trustworthy," shows that "amin" is precisely the equivalent of Shiloh, and conveys all the significations contained in it.

Muhammad, before he was called by God to preach the religion of Islam and to abolish the idolatry which he successfully accomplished, was the most quiet and truthful man in Mecca; he was neither a warrior nor a legislator; but it was after he assumed the prophetic mission that he became the most eloquent speaker and the best valiant Arab. He fought with the infidels sword in hand, not for his own personal interest, but for the glory of Allah and for the cause of His religion—Al-Islam. He was shown by God the keys of the treasures of the earth, but he did not accept them, and when he died he was practically a poor man. No other servant of God, whether a king or a prophet, has rendered such an admirably great and precious service to God and to man as Muhammad has done: to God in eradicating the idolatry from a large part of the globe, and to man by having given the most perfect religion and the best laws for his guidance and security. He seized the sceptre and the law from the Jews; fortified the former and perfected the latter. If Muhammad were permitted to reappear to-day in Mecca or Medina, he would be met by the Muslims with the same affection and "obedience" as he saw there during his earthly life. And he would see with a deep sense of pleasure that the holy Book

ISLAMIC REVIEW

he had left is the same without the least alteration in it, and that it is chanted and recited exactly as he and his companions did. He would be glad to congratulate them on their fidelity to the religion and to the unity of Allah; and to the fact that they have not made of him a god or son of a god.

As to the third interpretation of the name "Shiloh," I remarked that it might possibly be a corruption of "Shālūah," and in that case it would indisputably correspond to the Arabic title of the Prophet so often repeated in the Qur-án, namely, "Rasūl" which means exactly the same as Shalūah does, i.e. "an Apostle" or "Messenger." "Shalūah Elohim" of the Hebrews is precisely the "*Rasūl Allah*" which phrase is chanted five times a day by the Crier to the Prayers from the minaret of all the mosques in the world.

In the Qur-án several prophets, particularly those to whom a sacred scripture has been delivered, are mentioned as Rasūl; but nowhere in the Old Testament do we come across Shiloh or Shālūah except in the Testament of Jacob.

Now from whatever point of view we try to study and examine this prophecy of Jacob, we are forced, by the reason of its actual fulfilment in Muhammad, to admit that the Jews are vainly expecting the coming of another Shiloh, and that the Christians are obstinately persisting in their error in believing that it was Jesus who was intended by Shiloh.

Then there are other observations which deserve our serious consideration. In the first place it is very plain that the sceptre and the legislator would remain in the tribe of Judah so long as the Shiloh does not appear on the scene. According to the Jewish claim, Shiloh has not come yet. It would follow, therefore, that both the Royal Sceptre and the Prophetical Succession were still in existence and belonged to that tribe. But both these institutions have been extinct for over thirteen centuries.

In the second place it is to be observed that the tribe of Judah also has disappeared together with its royal authority and its sister—the prophetic succession. It is an indispensable condition for the maintenance of a tribal existence and identity to show that the tribe as a whole lives either in its

MUHAMMAD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

own fatherland or elsewhere *collectively* and speaks its own language. But with the Jews the case is just the reverse. To prove yourself to be an Israelite, you need hardly trouble yourself about it; for anybody will recognize you, but you can never prove yourself to belong to one of the twelve tribes. You are dispersed and have lost your very language.

The Jews are forced to accept one or the other of the two alternatives, namely, either to admit that Shiloh has come already, but that their forefathers did not recognize him, or to accept the fact that there exists no longer a tribe of Judah from which Shiloh will have to descend.

As a third observation it is to be remarked that the text clearly implies, and much against the Judæo-Christian belief, that Shiloh is to be a total stranger to the tribe of Judah, and even to all the other tribes. This is so evident that a few minutes of reflection are sufficient to convince one. The prediction clearly indicates that when Shiloh comes the sceptre and the lawgiver will pass away from Judah; this can only be realized if Shiloh be a stranger to Judah. If Shiloh be a descendant of Judah, how could those two elements cease to exist in that tribe? It could not be a descendant of any of the other tribes either, for the sceptre and the lawgiver were for all Israel, and not for one tribe only. This observation explodes the Christian claim as well. For Jesus is a descendant of Judah—at least from his mother's side.

I very often wonder at these itinerant and erring Jews. For over twenty-five centuries they have been learning a hundred languages of the peoples whom they have been serving. Since both the Ishmaelites and the Israelites are the offspring of Abraham, what does it matter to them whether Shiloh comes from Judah or Zebulun, from Esau or Isachar, from Ishmael or Isaac, as long as he is a descendant of their father Abraham? Obey the Law of Muhammad, become Muslims, and then it will be that you can go and live in your old fatherland in peace and security.

Friday Prayer and Sermon.—At the London Muslim Prayer House
—111, Campden Hill Road, Notting Hill Gate, London—every Friday
at 1 p.m. **Sunday Lectures** at 5 p.m. **Qur-án and Arabic**
Classes—every Sunday at 3.30 p.m.
Service, Sermon, and Lectures every Sunday at the Mosque, Woking,
at 3.15 p.m. Every Friday at 1 p.m.

IS OUR HOUSE IN ORDER?¹

By AL-HAJJ LORD HEADLEY

RELIGIOUS bodies, Governments, and individuals should never tire of asking themselves this question. Here are we Muslims endeavouring to show to Western nations that Islam, on account of its simplicity and freedom from priestly domination and dogmas, is the best religion to adopt. And to confirm this we point to our belief in the one and only God and beneficence to all our fellow-creatures as being practically all that is required of us. The Almighty Creator and Cherisher of the human race has asked nothing more through the mouths of His Holy Prophets, and we therefore look upon our Faith as one which is eminently *rational*—it can be readily understood and in its purest form is free from gross improbabilities. There is such ample reason for the establishment of a code such as that which is supposed to guide us, but can we as Muslims claim that our Faith, as at present preached and practised, is one which is altogether free from the drawbacks which hamper other beliefs? If not, it should be our chief care to instantly set about putting our house in order and endeavour to prove to the world that we are in earnest.

The Christianity of Jesus Christ was not the Church Christianity fabricated by priests and monks long after his time and which is now called "Christianity." Is it possible to conceive two people more unlike than Christ and Athanasius?

The Islam preached by our Holy Prophet Muhammad contains very different ethics from those advanced by puritanic fanatics and sects which have sprung into existence since his time.

Both these great Prophets of God were uneducated and illiterate men—the one a carpenter and the other a camel-driver—and this fact alone seems to me to be sufficient proof of the genuineness of their Messages : being unlearned, they

¹ Being the text of a lecture delivered on Sunday, July 29, 1928, before the British Muslim Society, 111, Campden Hill Road, Notting Hill Gate, London, W. 8. Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi', of Lahore, India, was in the chair.

IS OUR HOUSE IN ORDER ?

were incapable of fabricating. They were altogether unlike the scribes and Pharisees who followed them and artfully made capital out of their teachings to serve their own ends. Learned, and cunning, and unscrupulous, these "followers" traded on credulity and fostered ignorance, freely using the terrors of the unknown and the wrath of the angry deity to help them in the attainment of their own ends and aims.

I do not think it is going too far to say that the dogmas of modern Christianity are no more attributable to Christ than the ravings of a mad mullah in the wilds of Africa can be ascribed to Muhammad.

I cannot find any clear or convincing proof that dogmas, such as the Divinity of Christ, thinking of the Trinity in a particular way, the Sacraments, the Atonement and the Immaculate Conception, were ever sanctioned by Christ himself. Not long ago I received a letter from a devout Protestant who assured me that no prayers could possibly reach the Almighty unless the words "Through Jesus Christ our Lord" were added. This, of course, is dogmatic to the last degree, since it excludes from God's attention all the millions of earnest supplications sent to Him by human beings ever since assistance has been sought from on high.

Similarly, I am unable to obtain any satisfactory evidence, from the Qur-án or elsewhere, that many of the outward forms and ceremonies of modern Islam were ever laid down by the Holy Prophet of Arabia as essential to the Muslim Faith. Both Faiths seem to have been tampered with, and sectarianism has eaten very deeply into both the great Religions. Neither can afford to throw stones, and it is only by a full recognition of our failings that we can hope to make really satisfactory advances towards improvement.

As the poet Keats so pithily puts it:—

Fanatics have their dreams, wherewith they weave
A paradise for a sect.

Which of the two great Faiths is in the worst condition ? Which is suffering most from this insidious internal complaint ? are questions we need not now go into. No one will deny

ISLAMIC REVIEW

that the trouble is there and that it sticks fast like some parasitic disease which affects the whole Religion in a more or less disastrous manner.

There is a story told of a good man who died and knocked for admission at the gate of Heaven. St. Peter opened the door and, having consulted a book, found his name and welcomed him in. The good man looked round and found everything very beautiful, and just as he had expected; but there was one portion shut off by a heavy curtain, which he went up to with the intention of drawing it aside. St. Peter instantly called him back, saying: "You must not touch that curtain or draw it aside on any account." He said: "Why not?" "Well," said St. Peter, "the fact of the matter is that behind that curtain are the Plymouth Brethren, and they think they are the only people here." This gives a not very much overdrawn picture of a certain kind of fanaticism prevalent in the West. I think the story would be improved by making St. Peter quote the lines of the poet which I have given above.

Many years ago, when I was visiting India for the first time, I chanced upon a violent conflict which was going on just over the central span of a bridge. The combatants were in deadly earnest and were throwing one another into the deep river on either side; on my inquiring from my boatman the cause of the tumult, he said: "O sahib, those are the Sunnis and the Shiahhs; they always fight when they meet." This is but another type of fanaticism which calls into play brute force and cruelty to enforce certain matters in no way connected with our duty to God or our neighbour. For the benefit of those of my hearers who may be unaware of the crux, I may point out that the main difference between Sunnis and Shiahhs is to be found in the fact that the Shiahhs regard Ali (the son-in-law and cousin of the Prophet) as the first rightful Imam or Caliph, and reject Abu Bakr and the two other Caliphs accepted by the Sunnis, who hold that since Ali, *in his lifetime*, accepted Abu Bakr and the others, there is no reason for going against his wishes after his death. Since the successorship of the Caliphate question, which rightly or wrongly was settled over thirteen hundred years ago, can

IS OUR HOUSE IN ORDER ?

make no difference whatever to our duties as citizens of the world to-day, it is high time that all such disputes should be relegated to the limbo of oblivion.

Neither this country nor India, nor, indeed, any civilized quarter of the globe, can look forward with any degree of equanimity to any leaning towards a return to the hideous tortures indulged in by the educated miscreants who ran the "holy Inquisition" not so very many years ago.

Human nature has not altered much since the creation of man, and, given too much freedom, there is no saying to what extent sacerdotal chicanery might return to its own. There are, I firmly believe, fanatics who would cheerfully cut one's throat for failure to fall in with their views on quite unimportant matters, and such people would justify the murder by saying that it was done "to save your soul." It is true that we have one great safeguard in the giant strides of scientific advancement. Science is ever turning over the leaves of the great book of Nature and so discovering to our wondering senses fresh beauties, and leading us nearer the truth which, as I have often said, cannot be very far from the Throne of God. I hope that in time the folly and impropriety of fighting over matters which cannot by any stretch of imagination be regarded as essentials to the Faith will influence Muslim ethics, for it may be pointed out that such conduct is directly opposed to the Islamic teachings that *there should be no compulsion in Religion*.

Whether the Sunnis or the Shiahhs are correct in their tenets respecting the Caliphate; whether the Wahabis, sometimes called the Puritans of Islam, are worthy or not of support in their strict views concerning matters of formality; whether the various other Islamic sects are necessary as branches to the parent stem, may all be debatable points, but there are few Muslims who will not realize that the existence of so many conflicting parties constitutes a great source of weakness to Islam.

During the whole of my recent tour in India, from December 16, 1927, to June 6, 1928, there was not one discordant note, and my main texts at nearly all the many big meetings

ISLAMIC REVIEW

were *The dangers of sectarianism* and *The importance of toleration*. It was, as you may imagine, a source of the greatest satisfaction to me to receive a most hearty welcome and patient hearing at places like Bombay, Delhi, Agra, Lahore, Rawal Pindi, Peshawar, Wazirabad, Sargodha, as well as many other towns and districts which I had the honour and pleasure of visiting. Then I was fortunate in arriving at Hyderabad on the birthday of His Exalted Highness the Nizam, which falls on January 26th. I was enabled to attend the banquet in his honour and later on to have several interviews with him. On one of these occasions he made the very princely donation of Rs. five lakhs towards the cost of building a suitable Mosque in London, and since then he has sanctioned a further three lakhs. I had expected this great Ruling Prince to donate handsomely, but I must confess that such a munificent gift as £60,000 came as a very agreeable surprise, and it has had two good results, one being the practical certainty of getting our Mosque—which is to be called the London Nizamiah Mosque—built in the great metropolis; and the other is the encouragement it gives to all Muslims to help us in presenting to the Western world a true version of what Islam really is. I think it also goes far towards refuting the gloomy forebodings of those pessimists who, alarmed by the apathy to be found in some quarters, jump to the conclusion that nothing can be done and that the Religion itself is on the downward path, if not actually moribund. No words are strong enough to be used in condemning those who deliberately discourage others who are trying to do good work in a good cause. If Islam is in such a bad way as we might be led to suppose, surely that in itself is sufficient proof that workers are needed and that they should receive hearty support from all good Muslims. There is plenty of vitality in Islam—Muslims are *increasing*, not *diminishing*, in numbers. I have recently been over the beautiful Mosque in Paris, and have been much struck by the elegance of the design and the thoroughly solid and artistic work which everywhere prevails. The Paris Mosque is built on about 8,000 square metres, and it is improbable that we shall be able to secure so large an area

IS OUR HOUSE IN ORDER?

as that in any suitable site in London. But we must try our best, and I am not without hope that we shall receive assistance from those who wish us well in our very reasonable desire to see Islam represented by a handsome building which may compare favourably with many other beautiful places of worship in London.

It should be borne in mind that we must select the site before we attempt to design the building, because a style of architecture which might do very well in one set of surroundings would possibly be quite out of place in another. Also, we can hardly expect such a big area as they have been fortunate enough to secure in Paris in rather an out-of-the-way neighbourhood. The question of climate also has to be considered, and it may be fairly surmised that, roughly speaking, the better and more central the site the smaller will be the area. So that you will not wonder that I am rather diffident about making any definite statements upon points which are still to be settled. There are many matters, for instance, connected with the proposed hostel, the library and the lecture hall, which require very careful consideration. In the Paris Mosque—or rather immediately adjacent—there are excellent Turkish baths, tea and coffee divans, as well as displays of beautiful Moorish carving and silver, copper and brass work. This part of the Mosque is run by a capable Algerian or Tunisian gentleman who pays a big rent, and this rent helps to pay the expenses of the Mosque. What strikes one so forcibly after going over the French Mosque is this: If France with comparatively few Muslim subjects can afford a Mosque in its capital city, surely it is rather a stigma or disgrace that England, with over 110,000,000 British Muslims, should lag behind? Our King rules over about as many Muslims as there are people in the United States of America. And these Muslims have fought for us and died for us, and shown themselves good citizens and loyal subjects over and over again. There are those who advance the opinion that there are not enough evidences of the necessity of a Mosque in London; in other words, that there are too few Muslims in London to fill such a place of worship. To all such I would

ISLAMIC REVIEW

point out that the large floating Muslim population of London would be attracted for a year or two by the actual building operations and that many would attend the services for Friday prayers and Sunday lectures who do not feel drawn to either Notting Hill Gate or, on account of the distance, to the pretty little Mosque at Woking. Sir Abbas Ali Baig and myself feel our responsibility in the matter of selecting the site; until this is done we cannot attempt inviting designs. The task is rendered more difficult on account of the high values put upon land in central positions in the Metropolis.

To revert shortly to the Islamic sects. Only a few months ago I was addressing a meeting of the Central Asian Society on the occasion of a lecture entitled "Ferments in the World of Islam," and in the course of my remarks I mentioned that, in addition to the sects of early days, there had recently sprung up a new sect—the followers of the late Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, who was a learned and devout Muslim and the author of a large number of publications on Islamic subjects. The branch of the Ahmadians—called Quadianis to distinguish them from the original Ahmadians of Lahore—has added very considerably to the ferments in Islam, and therefore it was impossible for me to avoid mentioning the fact and giving some account of the tenets of the new sect.

I gave it as my opinion that this Quadiani sect is doing disservice to Islam, partly on account of its intolerance and more particularly because it is fundamentally different from the simple Muslim teaching of duty to God and one's neighbour. According to Keats, whose lines I have just quoted, the Quadianis are weaving a Paradise for their own delectation in the future state, and in that Paradise there will be no room for us poor ordinary Muslims. As I do not want to be accused of making an unjust statement or complaint against these wanderers from the fold, I now give a few facts as to their actual tenets as explained in their book *Ahmad*.

To begin with, they say that an Ahmadian of the Quadiani persuasion may not say his prayers under the leadership of an Imam who is not of that Faith; that a Quadiani may not give his daughter in marriage to a Muslim who is not a Quadiani

IS OUR HOUSE IN ORDER?

Ahmadian; that anyone of the Quadiani persuasion may not attend the funeral service of a deceased Muslim friend unless that friend is of the same Faith. This last rule seems particularly severe and cruel, but it is further affirmed that all those who do not acknowledge that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was the "Promised Messiah" and Prophet of God are "deprived of the light of Faith," and that non-belief in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is as bad as non-belief in the Holy Prophet Muhammad himself!

It seems strange that the supporters of this latest sect should have been offended—as they undoubtedly were—at my calling attention to their tenets, since many of the "ferments" in Islam have been entirely due to them. All the conflicting sects within the world of Islam are so many sources of weakness, but they are especially so when they differ from the Muslim Faith on fundamental and essential points.

Why should this small new sect take upon itself to say that all those refusing to recognize Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as the Messiah should be called kafirs or infidels?

I have frequently been asked if the Quadianis are really Muslims, and my reply has always been: "Yes, they are undoubtedly Muslims, but they seem to me to have wandered somewhat far from the true path." They have, of course, no right whatever to call other Muslims kafirs for not agreeing with them. This display of intolerance on their part has led to many unfavourable comments and has given offence and pain throughout the Muslim world.

From the time I landed in India towards the end of last year, to the time I left that country in June, I made a point of emphasizing the great importance of *avoiding intolerance, and awakening to a true sense of our duty towards Islam*. For many years there have been complaints of the apathy and indifference of Muslims here and elsewhere, and it is in the hope of overcoming to some extent this lamentable state of affairs, and also checking fanaticism and intolerance, that we are looking forward to the erection of the London Mosque. This Mosque is to be entirely non-sectarian, and it will, we

ISLAMIC REVIEW

hope, fittingly memorialize a fresh awakening to the beauty of Islam.

The Jews have their synagogues, the Christian Scientists, the Roman Catholics, the Hindus, and many other religionists, their places of worship, and as yet the Muslims, who number in their ranks over 110,000,000 British subjects, are unrepresented in the heart of the great metropolis of the British Empire. There is at present no large London Mosque in a central position. It is stated, I think on good authority, that His Majesty King George actually rules over more Muslims than Christians, and on this account I for one should like to think that the many thousands of Muslims who visit England every year and form what may be called our floating Muhammadan population should be able to point with respect and gratification to the London Nizamiah Mosque as a building worthy to take its place amongst the many fine buildings devoted to the worship of God.

I feel sure that there are many people who will agree with me that in these days—when Bolshevism and Atheism are rampant and are busily engaged in leading the young into the devious paths of *unbelief in anything and contempt for the Creator*—every encouragement should be given to the true believers in Islam which so plainly spells Duty to God and one's neighbour. Islam is indeed practically the same Faith as that originally taught by Jesus Christ and revived in clearer language by the Great Prophet of Arabia some six hundred years later. It would indeed be a blessed consummation—devoutly to be wished—if we could see pure Christianity working with pure Islam in a holy struggle against Atheism and Idolatry. I fear, however, that the great obstacle to this union of forces will ever be found in the hostile attitude of religious leaders.

It is much to be regretted that those who guide the thoughts of the people on sacred matters have too often looked upon priesthood or priestcraft as a *profession* instead of—as it should be—a *calling*.

Thus it sometimes happens that those who arrogate to themselves special sacerdotal powers and influence are able to

IS OUR HOUSE IN ORDER?

exercise those powers to the detriment of true religion. The pagan whisperings of the Delphic Oracle have, as it were, echoed down the aisles of the ages and dulled the clear tones which have ever marked the original utterances of the Holy Prophets of God.

I have no desire to cavil or pose as a carping critic; I am solely influenced by a keen desire to see Islam, as I and many others understand it, presented in its true colours: just as I should like to see true Christianity applied in its earliest and simplest form towards the uplifting of the world. If we Muslims wish Islam to be regarded as the exemplar of all the religions, we should lose no time in purging it of its dross so that it may appear to our opponents and all others as free from schism and those sacerdotal dogmas—a belief in which cannot fail to produce ridicule and contempt. Remember, we live in an age when science, our surest and truest ally, is daily advising us on the “Book of Knowledge fair”; let us be guided by the Qur-án and what we believe to be common sense when we are advancing our tenets in the hope of convincing the peoples of the West. To do this with any chance of pronounced success we must be particular to draw a line between what is essential and what is after all applicable to some particular time or some peculiar race requiring special training, e.g. the Children of Israel under Moses, or the Arabian savages under Muhammad. In these days we do not have to rebuke people for making golden calves or images; nor do we have to restrain people from burying alive their little girl babies at the feet of hideous idols. Also we refrain from giving educated and civilized people instructions as to matters of cleanliness and what parts of their persons they should wash.¹ All such instructions were valuable to the extremely dirty denizens of vermin-infected tents of the early Bedouin Arabs, but are not of much value where there is plenty of good water laid on. And there is another point not to be lost sight of, and it is this: In most parts of Arabia there

¹ We are afraid we have to differ from his Lordship in this matter. Our experience tells us that people in Europe as well as elsewhere still require instructions as to matters of cleanliness. (ED. I.R.)

ISLAMIC REVIEW

is a terrible dearth of water, and instructions had to be given as to how to make the most of it when the oasis was reached. The conditions are altogether different in, say, London or any big town, where there is a plentiful supply of water and people are always able to wash, and always do wash, either in their own houses, in the excellent public washhouses, or in the numerous swimming-baths which abound everywhere.

We must put our own house in order and then we shall be able to point out the defects in our neighbour's—it is the old story of the mote and the beam in the eye. But what do we find on examination? We find that dogmas and sectarianism—working through a few hundred years—have obscured the original tenets so that they are hardly recognizable. What with pious frauds, often *with good intent*, and sacerdotal trickery and humbug, often *with evil intent*, and selfish gains in view, we hardly know where we are.

At the present moment the Religions of the world seem to be undergoing a very rigorous inspection, one might almost call it an exalted competitive examination, so that men may have the opportunity of selecting the most workable Religion and that which is freest from improbabilities and fables of ancient date. All these Religions teem with beautiful thoughts and injunctions and, as a rule, the codes of morality are high and to be respected by all people. The ultimate aim is usually duty to God and to one's neighbour. But unfortunately, when you come to examine some of the forms and observances and find that these are magnified until they become of vital importance and are placed along with deadly sins or beatific virtues, you naturally begin to ask questions. Can it matter what I *think*? Surely it must be "what I *do*" that matters.

It is not my intention to go into the various dogmas which are to be found in many Religions and are held to be of vital importance; it is rather to point out that, in these days of reason, it is well to secure a belief in that Faith which presents the fewest pitfalls and what may fairly be called "aids to unbelief." Every time you tell a man some strange tale of a highly improbable character, and insist upon it that a belief

ISLAM'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS WOMEN

in that tale is essential to his salvation, you are paving the way to permanent unbelief.

We have to take the world as it is, and not as we would wish it to be. Our knowledge is very limited, and when we look around and see the cruelties of Nature, the terrible sufferings of the brute creation and poor little innocent and helpless children, can we avoid wondering how it is that the All-Merciful permits such things to be? Does it not seem impossible to reconcile Love and Justice with the cruelty and unfairness we see all around us? We cannot realize what it all means. We know that daily and hourly our better and sensitive nature is harrowed by accounts of evil doings all over the world, apparently the work of the devil himself, but we must not give up our belief in God because we are at present unable to fathom the deep mysteries of the creation. We should say with all humility, "Thy Will be done," and try to recognize the fact that His ways are not our ways. I believe that ultimately the simple Faith of Islam will be the religion of the whole world, for there is in it so little that is controversial and so much that appeals to the heart as well as to the understanding.

ISLAM'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS WOMEN AND ORPHANS

By C. A. SOORMA

CHAPTER V

WOMAN UNDER HINDUISM

Now let us turn our attention to the status of woman under Hindu Law.

Manu, the Hindu lawgiver, speaking of the duties and characteristics of women, says (*N.B.*—Manu's authority is paramount throughout India among Hindus):—

- (a) "By a girl, by a young woman, or even by an aged one, nothing must be done independently, even in her own house" (Manu, v. 147).

ISLAMIC REVIEW

- (b) " In childhood a female must be subject to her father, in youth to her husband, when her lord is dead to her sons; a woman must never be independent " (Manu, v. 148). (Note the striking resemblance to the status of woman under Roman and Greek laws, as given previously).
- (c) " She must not seek to separate herself from her father, husband or sons; by leaving them she would make both (her own and her husband's) families contemptible " (Manu, v. 149).
- (d) " Him to whom her father may give her, or her brother with the father's permission, she shall obey as long as he lives, and when he is dead, she must not insult (his memory) " (Manu, v. 151).
- (e) " Though destitute of virtue, or seeking pleasure (elsewhere), or devoid of good qualities, (yet) a husband must be constantly worshipped as a god by a faithful wife " (Manu, v. 154).
- (f) " Through their passion for men, through their untamable temper, through their natural heartlessness, they become disloyal towards their husbands however carefully they may be guarded in this world " (Manu, ix. 14).
- (g) " (When creating them) Manu allotted to women (a love of their) bed, (of their) seat and (of) ornament, impure desires, wrath, dishonesty, malice, and bad conduct " (Manu, ix. 17).
- (h) " It is the nature of women to seduce men in this (world); for this reason the wise are never unguarded in (the company of) females " (Manu, ii. 213).
- (i) " For women are able to lead astray in (this) world not only a fool, but even a learned man, and (to make) him a slave of desire and anger " (Manu, ii. 214).
- (j) " One should not sit in a lonely place with one's mother, sister, or daughter; for the senses are powerful, and master even a learned man " (Manu, ii. 215).

Poor woman! Her lot is unpleasant indeed. The texts I have quoted indicate clearly the extremely inferior status which

ISLAM'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS WOMEN

woman occupied under Hindu Law. At no period in her life is she to become free and independent. She is to remain under the perpetual *tutelage* of her male relations as long as she lives. She is born to seduce men and lead them astray, and not even a father is safe from his daughter, nor a son from his mother!

There is a good deal of controversy as to whether polygamy is sanctioned by Hindu Law. According to Manu, the law on the subject is as follows:—

- (a) “ For the first marriage of twice-born men (wives) of equal caste are recommended; but for those who through desire proceed (*to marry again*) the following females, (chosen) according to the (direct) order (of the castes) are most approved.” (Here follows the list of women who may be approved of.) (Manu, iii. 12.)
- (b) “ If, after one damsel has been shown, another be given to the bridegroom, *he may marry them both* for the same price; that Manu ordained ” (Manu, viii. 204).
- (c) “ If twice-born men wed women of their own and of other (lower castes), the seniority, honour, and habitation of those (wives) must be (settled) according to the order of the castes (*varna*) ” (Manu, ix. 85).
- (d) “ Among all (twice-born men) the wife of equal caste alone (not a wife of a different caste by any means), shall personally attend her husband and assist him in his daily sacred rites ” (Manu, ix. 86).
- (e) “ But he who foolishly causes that (duty) to be performed by another while his wife of equal caste is alive, is declared by the ancients (to be) as (despicable) as a *Kandala* (sprung from the) Brahmana caste ” (Manu, ix. 87).

The above quotations clearly indicate that Manu sanctioned polygamy, “ and it is now quite settled in the Courts of British India that a Hindu is absolutely without restriction as to the number of his wives, and may marry again without his wife's

ISLAMIC REVIEW

consent, or any justification, except his own wish" (Mayne, on *Hindu Law and Usage*, p. 113. Also held in the case of *Viraswamy v. Appaswamy*, 1 Mad. H.C., at p. 378).

Child-marriages appear to be sanctioned by Manu, as is evident from the following text :—

" A man aged thirty years shall marry a *maiden of twelve* who pleases him, or a man of twenty-four a *girl eight years of age*; if (*the performance of*) *his duties would (otherwise) be impeded, (he must marry) sooner*" (Manu, ix. 94).

The abuses of child-marriage among certain Hindus is too well known to need emphasis here. Let us hope that with greater education this evil custom will soon disappear.

As regards the remarriage of *widows*, there appears to be some doubt as to whether Hindu Law sanctions it or not. Narada, another Hindu lawgiver, expressly sanctions it, while the authority of Manu is strongly opposed to it. Manu says:—

- (a) " At her pleasure let her *emaciate* her body by (living on) pure flowers, roots and fruit, but *she must never even mention the name of another man after her husband has died*" (Manu, v. 157).
- (b) " Until her death let her be patient (of hardships), self-controlled, and chaste, and strive (to fulfil) that most excellent duty which (is prescribed) for *wives who have one husband only*" (Manu, v. 158).
- (c) " The nuptial texts are applied *solely to virgins*, and nowhere among men to females who have lost their virginity, for such (females) are excluded from religious ceremonies" (Manu, viii. 226).

The only exception which he appears to allow is in the case of a girl whose husband has died before consummation, who may be married again to the brother of the deceased bridegroom:—

" If the (future) husband of a maiden dies after troth verbally plighted, her brother-in-law shall wed her

ISLAM'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS WOMEN

according to the following rule." (Here follows the rule.) (Manu, ix. 69.)

It may, therefore, be safely asserted that among the high-caste Hindus, especially among the Brahmins, remarriage of widows is non-existent, as it is prohibited. On the other hand, among the lower castes, widows are permitted to remarry (Mayne, *op. cit.*, pp. 115-116). This Brahmanical prohibition was once carried to such an extreme that a widow was enjoined and sometimes forcibly burned on the funeral pyre along with her husband's body, or, if he died at a distance, was burned on a pyre of her own. Akbar, the Great Mogul, prohibited it, and after the decay and fall of the Mogul Empire this barbarous custom regained its old hold, and it was not until 1829, when Lord William Bentinck, the then Governor-General of India, made *Suttee* culpable homicide, that it died out (*Chambers' Encyclopædia*, vol. ix. p. 793).

As regards the wife's *legal status* and her right to separate ownership of property, let me quote the following in support of the contention that Hindu Law does not recognize her as a *feme-sole* for many purposes:—

"He only is a perfect man who consists (of three persons united)—his wife, himself, and his offspring; they (says the Veda) and (learned) Brahmanas propound this maxim likewise—'the husband is declared to be one with the wife' " (Manu, ix. 45).

"As under the Roman Law, '*Nuptiae sunt divini juris et humani communicatio*' the wife's gotra (relatives) becomes that of her husband; her complete initiation is effected by her marriage; she renounces the protection of her paternal manus and passes into the family of her husband. The connection being thus intimate, there should be no litigation between the married pair, and according to Apastamba there can be no division between them. Any property which the married woman may acquire is usually her husband's. A thing delivered to her is effectually delivered to the husband, and what is received from her is as if received from him. Her full owner-

ISLAMIC REVIEW

ship of her *stridhan* (i.e. generally property given to her by her relatives and husband on marriage for her own use) is subject to the qualification that her husband may dispose of it in case of distress, and that her own power to alienate it is subject to control by him with the exception of the so-called *Sandayakam*, the gifts of affectionate kinsmen. . . . The identity between the married couple being thus complete . . . wealth is common to the married pair," but this constitutes in the wife (according to Jagannatha) only a secondary or subordinate property. "Her right in the husband's estate is not mutual like the co-extensive rights of united brethren. It is dependent on the husband's and ceases with its extinction. *Her legal existence is thus, in some measure, absorbed during her coverture in that of her husband*" (West and Majid, *Hindu Law*, pp. 85-86).

(a) Under the *Mitakshara* law of succession "the widow takes only a limited interest in the estate of her husband, called the widow's estate. On her death, the estate goes, not to her heirs, but to the next heirs of her husband, technically called *reversioners*. She is entitled only to the *income* of the property inherited by her. She has no power to dispose of the *corpus* of the property except in certain cases (e.g. in case of legal necessity). She may, however, alienate her life interest in the estate" (Mulla, *Principles of Hindu Law*, p. 34). (b) According to the *Mayukha* School the widow comes in after the son, son's son (where father is dead), son's son's son (where father and grandfather are both dead) (Mulla, *op. cit.*, p. 91). (c) According to the *Dayabhaga* School, again, the widow comes in after the son, grandson and great-grandson (Mulla, *op. cit.*, p. 100).

"The remarriage of a widow, though now legalized by the *Hindu Widows Remarriage Act of 1856*, *devests* the estate inherited by her from her deceased husband. By her second marriage she forfeits the interest taken by her in her husband's estate, and it passes to the next heirs of her husband as if she were dead. The reason is that a widow succeeds as the surviving half of her husband and she ceases to be so on remarriage. But a widow does not by remarriage lose her rights to succeed

ISLAM'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS WOMEN

to the estate of her son by her first husband " (Mulla, *op. cit.*, p. 34).

Under the *Mitakshara* law, the daughters do not take as joint-tenants with benefits of survivorship, but they take as tenants-in-common. In the Bombay Presidency, the daughter does not take a limited estate in her father's property, but takes the property absolutely. On her death, her share passes to her own heirs as her *stridham* (Mulla, *op. cit.*, p. 85).

This rule, with some modifications, is also adopted by the *Mayukha* and *Dayabhaga* schools of Hindu Law (Mulla, *op. cit.*, pp. 91 and 100).

But it must be noted that *daughters do not inherit until all the widows are dead*. This principle is accepted by all the main schools of law. Speaking generally, as between daughters, the inheritance goes first to the unmarried daughters; next, to daughters who are married and unprovided for; and lastly, to daughters who are married and well-to-do. No member of the second class can inherit while any member of the first class is in existence, and no member of the third class can inherit while any member of the first or the second class is in existence (Mulla, *op. cit.*, p. 36).

"Divorce is not known to the general Hindu Law. The reason is that a marriage, from the Hindu point of view, creates an indissoluble tie between the husband and the wife. Neither party, therefore, to a marriage can divorce the other unless divorce is allowed by custom. . . . Change of religion or loss of caste does not operate as a dissolution of marriage, nor does the adultery of either party, nor even the fact that the wife has deserted her husband and become a prostitute " (Mulla *op. cit.*, p. 427).

In this respect, as we shall see a little later, the attitude of Hindu Law resembles very much the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church, both regarding marriage as a sacrament, and holding the union of male and female to be indissoluble.

Obviously, as we have seen, the status of woman is very inferior under Hindu Law. The contrast is more significant when we compare her status to the status occupied by the Buddhist women, although, curiously enough, their status

ISLAMIC REVIEW

under both the systems of law is supposed to be based mainly upon the same laws of Manu! Why such a strong contrast should exist it is not possible to discuss here. That it does exist is clear, it is suggested, from the above comparative study.

(Copyright by the Author.)

EUROPE'S DEBT TO ISLAM.¹

By DR. GUSTAV DIERCKS

(Translated from the German by 'Abdu 'l-Majid, M.A.)

(Continued from the July number, p. 249.)

THE typical features of the pure Arabs are as follows: The skull, as well as the face, is completely oval, and possesses a great regularity, a beautiful, harmonious proportion, and an extraordinary fineness and elegance in details. The hair of the head is not curly, but even and jet-black, and its growth is sharply defined. The forehead is generally not very high, but pretty strongly convex; the cheek-bones do not protrude very much; the chin manifests a beautiful curve; the nose is aristocratic; the mouth is small; the teeth are dazzlingly white, toothache being unknown amongst the pure Arabs; the black fiery eyes in their almond-shaped cavities are protected by the long eyelashes, and furnished with an arch by the round eyebrows. All these together go to lend the Arabs, whose mien, as a rule, is serious, that powerful irresistible charm which they exercise over every foreigner. The whole of the head of an Arab is a standing, patent testimony to the intelligence, to the capacity for evolution and development, due to the great natural inherent qualities which the Arabs have always exhibited.

The rest of the body is, in general, of a medium size,

¹ A translation of *Die Araber im Mittelalter und ihr Einfluss auf die Kultur Europa's*, by Dr. Gustav Diercks. Leipzig, 2nd edn. 1822 pp. 35-41.

EUROPE'S DEBT TO ISLAM

symmetrical and finely proportionate; as a rule, it is lean and sinewy; it has an extraordinarily great power of resistance, because the Arab, right from his birth, is exposed to all kinds of climatic influences and changes, and for this reason, as well as through being constantly on the move, becomes thoroughly inured to hardship.

The psychic fundamental characteristics of the Semites manifest themselves likewise in the Arabs in the greatest purity and in a refined form. The soil, the climate, and the struggle for existence, which under the local outdoor circumstances was extremely hard, one and all led to a great development of subjectivism in the Arab. The interest for "I"—egotism—and for its extensions, namely, the family and the tribe, modifies the controlling disposition of the Arabian mind. The inward individual life of emotion and feeling was so great, so exuberant, that it allowed the mind to soar to very exceptional heights of abstract, theoretical speculations; it indeed constantly compelled it to turn everything to the account of "I," and to comprehend everything in the light of, and in connection with, "I." The crass egotism which can so readily grow out of such a soil found its corrective in the quality of charity towards animals and mankind (this charitable nature was forced upon the Arabs by their outdoor circumstances), in the unbounded hospitality which in the whole of the world is without a parallel elsewhere, in the unflinching faithfulness to their promises, and in the mighty sense of justice and honour which enthuses the Bedouins. Further, the sense of justice demands in itself an individual equality of all the Arabs, and out of this equality has arisen the impulse for freedom which makes it impossible for a real pure-bred Bedouin of the desert to place himself body and soul under anyone set over him in authority. He hates the courtiers and disdains him who makes a slave of himself; on this score he despises also those who reside in a town, those who lead a settled life, and he hates the luxurious life and the attractions and charms of civilization; for this reason also, he looks down upon trade and arts and crafts, upon everything, in short, which can in one way or another injure

his unrestricted freedom, everything, indeed, through which the self-consciousness of a Bedouin can come to harm. Accordingly he regards robbery as his birthright, which can be limited only by contracts. To whomsoever a Bedouin assures his protection, to that man, to his tribe, and to his family, it is assured unswervingly with the Bedouin's own property and person; that man can rely upon the Bedouin, he can trust him in just the same way as he would trust himself. But, on the contrary, the man who has an enemy in the person of the Bedouin possesses no means of protection against the Bedouin, no law shelters him or his property; he has only the magnanimity of the Bedouin upon which to rely. Infidelity and treachery are looked down upon as the meanest sort of crimes of which a Bedouin can ever be guilty. Murder has its punishment, and finds its limitations in the blood-revenge. For this reason it was always avoided as much as possible. Even for the deadly enemy, hospitality demands protection, even if only for a period of three and a quarter days. Moreover, one should not believe that robbery and thievery went unpunished. If the perpetrators were caught, they had to expect a severe punishment. The Arabs were distinguished by great moderation, sobriety, and simplicity, and the natural sharpness of their senses, aided by this as much as by their mode of life, was consequently heightened to an astonishingly great extent. Oratory, the talent for improvisation, the art of versification, are as much the natural gifts of a Bedouin as is the inclination for fanaticism. What he once acknowledges as true, what is proved to him to be true, for that he will always come forward with all the zeal and energy of which a man can be capable. As soon as an idea catches hold of him, he does not know any fear of death. The life of the desert ought to provoke in him his mental powers, especially the fantasy, the power of imagination in the highest degree, and this accounts for the fact that the Arab, who hated every kind of higher culture, became the carrier of sciences and certain branches of art. As to the relation of the Bedouin to woman, it can be said that in the earliest times it was very good and praiseworthy, and far

EUROPE'S DEBT TO ISLAM

nobler than it is to-day.¹ Certainly it was the wife who had to look after all the household business. But on the whole she was equal in rank with, and had the same rights as, the husband. The pre-Islamic love-poems present us with a body of testimony to the fact that it was not unusual for high idealistic love-relations to exist. Further, the old writers tell us that monogamy reigned in Arabia. But even so, the chivalry of the Arabs ought not in the least degree to be attributed to the high social status of the Arabian women.

The first appearance of the Arabs in the history of nations dates far back. One has good reason to believe that the Hyksos (a nomadic people who, according to Lauth, invaded Egypt in 2185 B.C. and lived there for a few centuries—nay, in certain parts thereof acquired the rule of the kingdom), were no other than the Arabs, and this view is still further justified when one finds Manetho mention the same fact, although there is another notice which alludes to Phœnicians. These foreigner-nomads appear as a rough people who destroyed culture. So stormy was their progress and on-march that the powers of the old, well-organized cultural kingdoms could not stand against them. But the conquerors speedily caught the infection of culture and were won over thereto. The outward character of the Hyksos has also a great similiarity with that of the Arabs after Muhammad. A second incident is told us by Diodor. According to this, a Himyarite king, Ariäus (as an ally of Ninus), had fought the Babylonians successfully and had returned laden with many treasures to his southern home. Further, we are told by Herodotus that Cambyses in his expedition against Egypt had entered into a treaty with an Arab king who was most probably a chieftain of the Syrian Bedouin tribes. According to this treaty, Cambyses' army was to be supplied with water by the Arabs on its way through the Syrian deserts. This mention is still more interesting

¹ The learned author does not quote his authority for these statements. The social status of woman in the pre-Islamic Arabia was undoubtedly inferior to what it is to-day. See Ameer Ali, *Spirit of Islam* (London, 1922); Muhammad Ali, *Muhammad the Prophet* (Lahore, 1924). (Transl.). The same remarks apply to the author's observations on monogamy. (Transl.)

owing to the information as to the ceremonies which were connected with the treaty, and Herodotus gives the Arabs a certificate to the fact that they held the treaties as sacred as any other people on the earth. Even outside the territory of the Arabian peninsula, barring all the state societies on the African soil, the Arabs founded independent kingdoms, namely, the one of Hira in Chaldea, famous for its patronage of art and of poetry, and secondly, that of the Ghassanids in Syria.

(To be continued.)

AID-BOOKS for the STUDY OF ARABIC

R. A. NICHOLSON, Litt.D. and F. DU P. THORNTON

	£	s.	d.
Elementary Arabic. First Reading Book	0	7	6
——— Second Reading Book	0	7	6
——— Third Reading Book	0	8	0
Brünnow-Fischer, Arabic Chrestomathy	0	15	0
Elias' Modern Dictionary Arabic-English , pp. 7. iv, 693 ...	1	0	0
——— Modern Dictionary English-Arabic , pp. 7. iii, 433 ...	0	15	0

Apply: Manager, Basheer Muslim Library, The Mosque, Woking, England.

BOOKS ON ISLAM TO READ

ALL the books given on the back cover of this number can be had at any one of the following:

Lahore.—THE MUSLIM BOOK SOCIETY, Azeez Manzil, Brandreth Road (India).

Bombay.—D. B. TARAPOREVALA SONS & Co., Booksellers, Kitab Mahal, 190, Hornby Road, Fort (India).

Calcutta.—THACKER SPINK & Co., Booksellers, P.O. Box 54 (India).

Calcutta.—THE MUSSALMAN PUBLISHING Co., LTD., 11/15, Karaya Bazar Road (India).

Hong-Kong.—MOHIDEEN & Co., 64, Queen's Road Central (China).

Singapore.—THE MUSLIM, 52, Kerbau Road (F.M.S.)

Durban.—UNION PRINTING WORKS, 137, Grey Street (S. Africa)